

REMARKS

This Amendment is filed in response to the non-final Official Action of February 13, 2006. The Official Action rejects all of the pending claims, namely Claims 1-31, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,498,982 to Bellsfield et al. in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,948,040 to DeLorme et al. As explained below, Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed invention is patentably distinct from Bellsfield and DeLorme, taken individually or in combination. Nonetheless, Applicants have amended independent Claims 1, 7 and 8, and added new dependent Claims 32-40 to more clearly define the claimed invention. As to the remaining independent claims, however, Applicants respectfully submit that the Official Action fails to establish *prima facie* obviousness of the claimed invention of independent Claims 14 and 22, or by dependency Claims 15-21 and 23-25. As such, Applicants respectfully traverse the rejections of the claims as being unpatentable over the Bellsfield patent or the DeLorme patent, taken individually or in combination. In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented herein, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and allowance of all of the pending claims of the present application.

Briefly, Bellsfield, which is assigned to Mapquest.com, Inc., discloses an automated travel planning apparatus and method that includes a map database, a routing database and a places of interest database. In operation, upon receipt of a selected geographic region, the apparatus displays a bit-mapped image of the region from images in the map database. A user then selects a departure and destination point, and the routing database is used to generate a route between the selected departure and destination points. Also, if the user requests a list of places of interest near the route, the places of interest database can be utilized to generate a list of places of interest that are within a predetermined distance of the generated route.

DeLorme discloses a travel reservation information and planning system and method. According to the method, users engage in a planning process for travel between an origin and destination via a number of intermediate waypoints. DeLorme allows users to plan, revise or edit travel plans, as well as preview alternate routes, select points of interest, and compare times and costs of transportation options such that the users can achieve a final travel plan. For

example, the system can facilitate a user planning a trip having a known travel destination as well as a date/time of arrival at the destination around which to build the trip.

A. Claims 1-13 and 26-40 are Patentable over Bellsfield and DeLorme

According to one claimed aspect of the present invention, a method and system are provided for graphically displaying travel information on an electronic map within a network environment. As recited by amended independent Claim 1, the method includes receiving an information request, and thereafter processing the information request to initiate at least one inquiry based upon the information request. Then, a plurality of responses are collected from an information server to determine a solution set to the information request, where the solution set includes one or more pairs of airports and one or more associated airfares for travel between the one or more pairs of airports. After determining the solution set, the solution set is rendered onto an electronic map overlay for transmission to a client.

In contrast to independent Claim 1, we note that neither Bellsfield nor DeLorme, taken individually or in combination, teach or suggest rendering a solution set unto an electronic map overlay for transmission to a client, the solution set including one or more pairs of airports and one or more fares for travel therebetween. In fact, the Examiner admits as much with respect to Bellsfield. Nonetheless, the Examiner alleges that DeLorme discloses this feature of the claimed invention, and that it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to modify Bellsfield to include this feature of DeLorme. As motivation, the Examiner alleges that such a combination provides the advantage of linking different digital computers, as well as providing travel materials such as airline tickets, POI displays, hotels, restaurant coupons and tickets.

Contrary to the interpretation of DeLorme proffered by the Official Action, we note that DeLorme does not teach or suggest rendering pair(s) of airports and airfare(s) for travel therebetween unto an electronic map, as recited by amended independent Claim 1. DeLorme does disclose calculating a cost associated with a particular travel arrangement, and comparing the costs of the particular travel arrangement with those of alternative travel arrangements. DeLorme also discloses displaying on a map a travel origin, destination and any intermediate waypoints therebetween. DeLorme does not teach or suggest, however, rendering an electronic

map that includes the airfare(s) for travel between pair(s) of airports. Moreover, we note that even if DeLorme did disclose displaying on a map airfares between pairs of airports, one skilled in the art would not be motivated to modify Bellsfield to include this feature, particularly since Bellsfield is directed to ground travel and generating routes between selected locations.

Applicants therefore respectfully submit that amended independent Claim 1, and by dependency Claims 2-6 and 26-40, is patentably distinct from Bellsfield and DeLorme, taken individually or in combination. Applicants also respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 7 and 8 recite subject matter similar to that of amended independent Claim 1, including the aforementioned features of determining a solution set including pair(s) of airports and associated airfare(s), and rendering or displaying the solution set on an electronic map. As such, Applicants also respectfully submit that amended independent Claims 7 and 8, and by dependency Claims 9-13, are also patentably distinct from Bellsfield and DeLorme, taken individually or in combination, for at least the reasons given above with respect to amended independent Claim 1.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 1-13 and 26-40 as being unpatentable over Bellsfield in view of DeLorme is overcome.

B. Claims 14-25 are Patentable over Bellsfield and DeLorme

According to a second claimed aspect of the present invention, methods are recited for providing travel information. As recited by independent Claim 14, the method includes receiving a request including a departure location, and generating a map including a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to another location. The generated map is then transmitted or otherwise received.

As to independent Claim 14, and similarly independent Claim 22, Applicants respectfully submit that the Official Action does not establish *prima facie* obviousness over Bellsfield in view of DeLorme. As stated in the MPEP, all of the elements of a claimed invention must be taught or suggested by the prior art to establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention. MPEP § 2143.03 (*citing In re Royka*, 490 F.2d 981 (CCPA 1974)). In the instant case, however, the

Official Action fails to allege prior art, including the Bellsfield patent or the DeLorme patent, individually or in combination, that teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention of the present application. More particularly, for example, nowhere does the Official Action allege any prior art that teach or suggest, individually or in combination, generating a map including a set of points corresponding to the departure location and any airports having carrier service from the departure location to another location, as recited by independent Claim 14, and similarly by independent Claims 22.

Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Official Action reconsider the claimed invention in light of all of the words of the claimed invention. *Id.* at § 2143.03 (*citing In re Wilson*, 424 F.2d 1382, 1385 (CCPA 1970)). Then, in the absence of a finding that the prior art teach or suggest all of the elements of the claimed invention, and a suggestion or motivation for combining the elements taught by such prior art, Applicants request allowance of Claims 14-25.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of Claims 14-25 as being unpatentable over Bellsfield in view of DeLorme is overcome.

Appl. No.: 10/771,798
Amdt. dated 05/15/2006
Reply to Official Action of February 13, 2006

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments to the claims and the remarks presented above, Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of the present restriction requirement. Should the Examiner have further questions or comments with respect to examination of this case, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner telephone the undersigned so that further examination of this application can be expedited.

It is not believed that extensions of time or fees for net addition of claims are required, beyond those that may otherwise be provided for in documents accompanying this paper. However, in the event that additional extensions of time are necessary to allow consideration of this paper, such extensions are hereby petitioned under 37 CFR § 1.136(a), and any fee required therefore (including fees for net addition of claims) is hereby authorized to be charged to Deposit Account No. 16-0605.

Respectfully submitted,



Andrew T. Spence
Registration No. 45,699

Customer No. 00826
ALSTON & BIRD LLP
Bank of America Plaza
101 South Tryon Street, Suite 4000
Charlotte, NC 28280-4000
Tel Charlotte Office (704) 444-1000
Fax Charlotte Office (704) 444-1111

ELECTRONICALLY FILED USING THE EFS-WEB ELECTRONIC FILING SYSTEM OF THE UNITED STATES PATENT & TRADEMARK OFFICE ON MAY 15, 2006.